Board of Trustees' Meeting Summary
The editor admits not to have read the Charleston newspaper of January 11th, which may have summarized the College's Board of Trustees' Meeting of January 10th. Even if the entire readership of this newsletter has done so, it seems appropriate to summarize the Board's actions:

--Student tuition and fees will go up $95 next year, the first increase in three years. The breakdown is as follows: tuition up $75, Capital Improvement Fund up $3, athletics up $15, health service up $2. The $75 is justified as helping to defer increased costs of academic services such as new faculty lines. The athletics increase is justified as helping to pay for new sports added by the College (note: Dr. Lightsey was careful to say that the new sports were not a function of NCAA requirements, which had already been met).

--A new institutional refund policy was adopted which provides for a more liberal refund for students who withdraw during the first four weeks of a semester or the first several days of Maymester or Summer School. The justification for this refund policy was that the federal government is attempting to secure against the increase in federal student loan defaults.

--Craig cafeteria expansion plans were authorized.

--Sotile Theatre renovation plans, to authorize advertisement for architectural and engineering services, were approved.

--Construction of a redundant campus electrical loop was approved to make it less likely that major power outages would occur on campus.

--Negotiations to purchase 9 acres in Mt. Pleasant as a potential alternative to the Remley Point site for athletic facilities were given the go-ahead. It was pointed out that this particular item was very tentative and preliminary.

--Replacement of trees lost in the Cistern area was approved to the tune of $40,000.

--Renovation requests for the Old Gym were approved as a high campus priority.

Univ. of Penn. v. EEOC--US Supreme Court and the Privacy of Letters in Tenure Disputes
Professor Rosalie Tung was denied tenure at the Wharton School of Business in 1985. She filed a complaint against Penn, arguing that she was discriminated against in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII. EEOC sought access to peer review material to ascertain the validity of Professor Tung's complaint. The University refused the request for that material and EEOC then subpoenaed the peer review letters on Professor Tung and five male professors, all of whom were granted tenure. The University was ordered to comply at the US District Court and US Court of Appeals levels. Penn appealed to the US Supreme Court, which agreed with the lower courts' rulings in Justice Blackmun's opinion, which was signed by all eight of the other High Court justices.

Specifically, the Supreme Court ruled that EEOC need only show that the subpoenaed material was relevant to its inquiry. "This is the same standard that applies when the commission investigates a charge of discrimination in a business not related to education" (New York Times: 12).

The University--along with AAUP--had argued that there would be direct and substantial inhibitions on the part of faculty members who were required to write letters of peer review. Justice Blackmun argued that "if there is a 'smoking gun' to be found that demonstrates discrimination in tenure decisions, it is likely to be tucked away in peer review files" (id.). Additional claims of First Amendment protections were rejected by the Court.

The New York Times also quoted from statements made by legal counsel from Harvard and from Berkeley, among others, who indicated their views that faculty may be less candid in the future if peer review letters could not be guaranteed confidentiality. That this decision may complicate tenure and promotion decisions at the College of Charleston remains to be seen.

An Interview with Monica Scott:

Institutional Research and Campus Planning
[Editor's note: this is the next installment of our periodic interviews with key campus personnel. The interview took place on January 4th, 1990.]

Ed. The department under your name in the campus directory says "Institutional Research." What is that?

MS: Actually, it's Institutional Research and Campus Planning. There are two functions. The Institutional research office has a full time statistician and a full time temporary position. The office provides management information used by the College for essentially two purposes. One purpose is planning. Another is management decision-making. We collect, compile, and analyze data for those two activities. The new full time temporary position was added mainly because of CHE's mandate for Assessment. The main activities of the Institutional Research office include compiling required CHE and federal government reports (student characteristic reports, FTE reports, etc.), acting as a clearinghouse for external reports and questionnaires such as Peterson's Guide—which is a national report on colleges, and technical support for departments on studies regarding the campus. The other function in my area is Campus Planning. There are probably three main areas of concentration there: short term space allocation, long-term planning (3 to 5 years or longer) for improvements to the campus funded by state bonds and other sources of funding, and the implementation of those projects, which normally involves design and construction phases. Once a project is in the design phase, it becomes a joint function between this office and the Physical Plant. We will continue to stay with the project through its completion, however.

Ed. You have been with this particular office how long?

MS: Since May of 1980. When the Vice President retired, I took his tasks relating to Campus Planning in 1985. There was some reorganization of the office at that time.

Ed. You report to whom?

MS: Fred Daniels, Senior Vice President for Institutional Resources.

Ed. How do you become aware of Campus Planning needs?

MS: Observation is one way. The condition of a facility often dictates the need for a capital project. People making needs known is a second way. Likewise, the addition of a new academic program or other activity can require new kinds of space. And obviously, any significant decline or increase in enrollment has a far reaching impact on all types of facilities.

Ed. From the time the new academic program became established from the Faculty through Academic Affairs and the Board of Trustees, what are the next steps?

MS: It is always the case that resources are scarce for long-term capital projects. Bond bills are normally biannual in South Carolina. There is fierce competition for those monies. The lead time necessary is several years for the completion of any funded project.

Ed. Do we even consider making plans for a new facility before the monies are funded?

MS: Years before; we have definite plans for projects way in advance. Since I have been here we have been asking for funds to renovate the Old Gym to support the PE/Health major. We have yet to be successful in getting any of that money. The Johnson Center was designed as an addition to the existing facility, the entire structure of which was determined to be necessary for that academic major program. Generally, the College was clever in planning for facilities by designing projects in increments to match the anticipated growth in enrollment. The Library, Science Center, and PE buildings were all planned in two phases. All of those facilities had in mind an enrollment of 5,000 FTEs. That was the original goal of the school when it became a state agency in 1970. CHE's master plans carry the 5,000 FTE number. Now, of course, with increased enrollments, there are new demands on the College's facilities, including dorms, cafeteria, bookstore, office space, library, student activities, parking, as well as the more conventional facilities like classrooms.

Ed. You touched upon the status of current facility use. You said once that CHE has a formula for facility use for classroom and lab utilization?

MS: The formula is very detailed. It looks at the number of stations in a classroom, how many students are using those stations, and for how many hours a day. The use is measured from 8 am to 5 pm. The two numbers are percent utilization for classrooms and percentage utilization for labs. Specialized space continued on the next page
such as sculpture studios and scientific research space are not included because they would skew the data. This is computed twice a year. The primary use of these data is to ensure that adequate classroom and lab space is available for the institutions to run their academic programs. Also, if a school is requesting approval to acquire additional space of this kind, CHE will use these percentages as one indicator of the school’s need for the new space. If we show low utilization based on accepted space standards in the state, the burden is on us to show why we need the new facility. There are other factors which might justify a new facility, such as need for renovation to respond to changes in teaching. Let’s say the Old Gym was a classroom building. We could build an argument for its renovation while at the same time explaining its low utilization rate, i.e., the facility has no heat or air systems, inadequate electrical and plumbing requirements, and so forth.

Ed. So we are in a position such that we have to build up our utilization percentage before we can start talking about a new classroom building?

MS: Yes, in part. Although it appears that we utilize our classroom facilities fully, our percentage rate isn’t as high as standards recommend because we don’t fill the 8 am and the 3 to 5 pm slots consistently. Also, the dead hour on Tuesdays and Thursdays contributes to the lower rate. The College’s classroom utilization rate this past Fall semester was 61%, and its lab rate was 33%. The recommended rate for classrooms is 60-70%, and the recommended range for labs is 40-50%. As you can see, our classroom use is approaching a point that would make a new facility justifiable.

Ed. Because this space utilization formula takes into account only classroom and lab space, is it easier to obtain approval for other types of facilities?

MS: It’s not necessarily easier, but at least another kind of facility does not carry with it a reported utilization figure that we need to justify in order to gain approval for the project.

Ed. So what are some of the new projects on the boards?

MS: The Avery Research Center renovation at 125 Bull Street will house that program’s offices, archival space, and some exhibit areas. Hurricane damage has set that project back until about midsummer. The first two floors of the Sears Building shortly will be advertised for construction bids (the basement houses central stores and warehouse now and the top floor remains unfinished for now because of funding constraints). The new bookstore will be about half of the ground floor of Sears; the remainder will be accounting and personnel offices; the second floor will be a Continuing Education/conferencing center with the potential for a lot of different configurations there; the offices for Professional Development and Community Services will be housed there also. A new dorm and expansion of the cafeteria are in the preliminary planning stages.

Ed. Who decided all of that?

MS: Various people and committees over many years have recognized and made known these needs. It’s been years since the bookstore has been adequate for enrollment. Accounting is now in the basement of the library and the library needs that space for stack and carrel space, the designed and appropriate use for it. It has always been considered a temporary location for Accounting. It made sense to put the bookstore in Sears because Sears was designed as a retail store. Some departments just naturally, because of their function, should be in close proximity to one another. Purchasing is already in Sears; putting Accounting and Personnel with them makes sense using that logic. When Personnel moves, Fine Arts can use that building.

Ed. I’ll tell you where I’m coming from as Faculty Speaker. There seems to be a critical shortage of faculty office space. And what the faculty sees is a series of plans for facilities where the last domino to fall—to put it bluntly, perhaps—the last priority, is faculty office space. Are there any plans where that need has a higher priority than it appears to have?

MS: First of all, until the recent enrollment surge, there was not a critical faculty office shortage. That is not to say that some departments didn’t have requirements not being met. What we have been trying to do is to consolidate departments, cluster small houses into patterns, for academic departments. Some departments did have more of a need than others, for example the English Department. Also, it is clear that adjunct faculty need space, where as before there was little need because most departments could accommodate the relatively little adjunct faculty they used. The perception that faculty have the lowest priority is mistaken. The
reality is a domino effect, to be sure. But the kinds of space that we have recently acquired dictate to a large degree what we put where. We couldn't put the bookstore in small houses, for example. It would be extremely inefficient to spread the Accounting office over several different locations. These departments, because of size but more importantly because of function, need to be in a single location. It doesn't mean that those departments have a higher priority; rather, the space just works better for their particular needs. We are now talking about another new dorm because the one just completed didn't give us the kind of breathing space we expected in terms of demand for housing.

Another new dorm, for example, would permit us to put academic departments, perhaps, in 2, 4, 6 and 8 Bull St, and take those houses out of the housing inventory and convert them to faculty office space. It isn't merely a matter of priorities or that faculty office space is lost to be considered. We first have to move some of these other departments to appropriate areas before the kind of space that works well for faculty offices can be made available.

The real broad priorities for the next couple of years, and not necessarily in priority order, include additional parking at reasonable cost, library space, faculty office space, dorm and cafeteria facilities, and classroom space. Some short term solutions to meet some of the classroom needs include adding four classrooms from the Education Center currently allocated to Professional Development. In all the development plans, new property that may be needed will most likely be to the north or south of the campus, rather than east or west. We have stated that we would not encroach any further into Harleston Village. Going east you encounter the King Street Corridor. Also, the majority of the kinds of space we need don't do well in houses, as we talked about before. There are some other alternatives we need to pursue in addition to acquiring new properties to satisfy our needs. For example, the Wentworth Street garage was designed as a five floor facility but only has four levels because of funding constraints at the time of construction. Both the former Sears building and the J.C. Long Building apparently were engineered for an additional floor. Also, we can look at reallocation of existing facilities by evaluating departments' current needs.

NEWS SHORTS

--Maymester pre-registration continues through February 15th in the Registrar's Office. Fees must be paid prior to May 4th. A drawing will be held after February 15th; the prize is the tuition for a Maymester course. All who pre-register by February 15th are automatically entered and are eligible to win. The College will receive FTE credit for students pre-registered by the February 15th deadline.

--Fifteen new faculty lines have been approved for the 1990-91 academic year; two full-time temporary lines also have been approved.

--Academic Affairs is proposing that each academic department assign one of its faculty as Liaisons to the Advising Center. This proposal includes having those faculty serve for a minimum of two years in that capacity, having that service count toward tenure as if it were service on a major faculty committee, arranging for faculty to assist in advising at the Center and during pre-registration, providing information to the Center on departmental programs, and receiving training through the Center. This proposal is on the agenda for the next department/program director meeting with Academic Affairs, set for February 5th.

--A class in the fundamentals of Re-evaluation Counseling (RC) is being offered in Charleston this month. Rick Lamma, a certified teacher of RC, will lead the class, assisted by Alexandra Buell. Participation by C of C faculty and other community leaders is especially encouraged. With RC training, teachers are in a singular position to enhance the educational experience for students, fellow faculty, and for themselves. For information on the free introductory lecture, please call Rick Lamma at 849-7909 (Mt. Pleasant).

Scott, continued utilization and seeing if some rearrangement wouldn't result in better utilization. Another option under preliminary discussion is a North Area location for some classes and office space to ease congestion on the main campus. A location there also would demonstrate the College's continuing commitment to the tri-county area students who cannot or will not otherwise come to the College. [Editor's note: growth is the subject of the Retreat to be held on January 20th on campus. Faculty are urged to attend.]

thanks to ms, smh, ssk, rl, twp, zb, bt, and cch for their assistance with this issue of Faculty Newsletter.